

Letters to the Editor

Published letters are subject to condensation, and those not selected for publication will be returned only when accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes. The use of pen names is limited to correspondents whose identity is known to The Star.

SIR: Adams-Morgan—this neighborhood is mine! It also belongs to my neighbors, the poor, the middle income, the people on pensions. We are the majority. This area is ours and we wish to stay in it. Who is this public in whose interest urban renewal is not? Certainly the National Capital Planning Commission did not have the present residents in mind, because they cannot afford to have private enterprise renew the neighborhood. You forgot to say in your February 9 editorial that those new or newly renovated properties which dilute our decay sufficiently to make the area ineligible for urban renewal assistance are all in the luxury category. Our poor and not-so-poor are being pushed out into someone else's neighborhood to make way for luxury.

Private investment says that it cannot afford to build low-income housing and that even middle-income housing does not provide sufficiently high returns to be worth the money. One of the better features of the late plan was the scattering of the "culturally deprived" into small islands of subsidized and low-income housing. If a child is part of a great sea of poverty, he has little chance of knowing there may be a better life and has less chance of learning how to attain it. Whether or not he finds a better life, that child will be the employee, the citizen of tomorrow. Thus for the sake of tomorrow's society, I urge that we be allowed to keep our neighborhood poor than send them out to increase the size of other depressed neighborhoods.

Mrs. N. A. Stacey.

25 YEAR RE-REVIEW